

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney
LAURA JEAN BERGER
Assistant United States Attorney
2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401
Fresno, CA 93721
Telephone: (559) 497-4000
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

Attorneys for Plaintiff
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

RAMON CERRANO, ALEXIS SERRANO,
ELEAZAR VALENZUELA, AND RAFAEL
RODRIGUEZ,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:22-CR-00242-ADA-BAM

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;
AND ORDER

DATE: November 9, 2022

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

BACKGROUND

This case is set for status conference on November 9, 2022. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued General Order 618, which suspended all jury trials in the Eastern District of California “until further notice.” Under General Order 618, a judge “may exercise his or her authority to continue matters, excluding time under the Speedy Trial Act with reference to the court’s prior General Order 611 issued on March 17, 2020 . . . with additional findings to support the exclusion in the Judge’s discretion.” General Order 618, ¶ 6 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020). In addition, any judge “may order case-by-case exceptions” to General Order 618’s provisions “at the discretion of that Judge or upon the request of counsel, after consultation with counsel and the Clerk of the Court to the extent such an order will impact court staff and operations.” General Order 618, ¶ 7 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020). This and previous General Orders were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

1 Although the General Orders address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has
 2 emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision “counteract[s] substantive
 3 openendedness with procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record findings” in a particular case.
 4 *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no
 5 exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at
 6 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a
 7 judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally
 8 or in writing”).

9 Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory
 10 and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, 617, and 618 require specific supplementation. Ends-of-
 11 justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his
 12 findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and
 13 the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable
 14 unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that
 15 the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public
 16 and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

17 The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code
 18 T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics,
 19 natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such
 20 circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance
 21 following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court
 22 recognized that the eruption created “appreciable difficulty” for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-69; *see*
 23 *also United States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time
 24 following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency).

25 The coronavirus poses a similar, albeit more enduring, “appreciable difficulty” to the prompt
 26 proceedings mandated by the statutory rules. Recently, the Ninth Circuit enumerated a “non-
 27 exhaustive” list of seven factors it found to be “relevant” in considering ends-of-justice Speedy Trial Act
 28 continuances “in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.” *United States v. Olsen*, --- F.3d ---, 2021 WL

1589359 at *7 (9th Cir. Apr. 23, 2021). That non-exhaustive list includes: (1) whether a defendant is detained pending trial; (2) how long a defendant has been detained; (3) whether a defendant has invoked speedy trial rights since the case’s inception; (4) whether a defendant, if detained, belongs to a population that is particularly susceptible to complications if infected with the virus; (5) the seriousness of the charges a defendant faces, and in particular whether the defendant is accused of violent crimes; (6) whether there is a reason to suspect recidivism if the charges against the defendant are dismissed; and (7) whether the district court has the ability to safely conduct a trial. *Id.*

In light of the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4). If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

STIPULATION

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant RAMON CERRANO, by and through defendant’s counsel of record Christina M. Corcoran, defendant ALEXIS SERRANO, by and through defendant’s counsel of record, Barbara H. O’Neill, defendant ELEAZAR VALENZUELA, by and through defendant’s counsel of record, Roger D. Wilson, and defendant RAFAEL RODRIGUEZ, by and through defendant’s counsel of record, Steven L. Crawford, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order, this matter was set for status conference on November 9, 2022.
2. By this stipulation, defendants now move to continue the status conference until January 25, 2023, and to exclude time between November 9, 2022, and January 25, 2023, under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4].
3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:
 - a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case includes extensive audio and video recordings and over 3,000 pages of Bates stamped discovery. All of this discovery has been either produced directly to counsel and/or made available for inspection and copying.

b) Counsel for defendants desire additional time to consult with their clients, to review the current charges, to conduct investigation and research related to the charges, to review and copy discovery for this matter, to discuss potential resolutions with their clients, and to otherwise prepare for trial.

c) Counsel for defendants believe that failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny them the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

d) The government does not object to the continuance.

e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of November 9, 2022 to January 25, 2023, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: November 2, 2022

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney

/s/ LAURA JEAN BERGER
LAURA JEAN BERGER
Assistant United States Attorney

1 Dated: November 2, 2022

/s/ CHRISTINA M.
CORCORAN
CHRISTINA M. CORCORAN
Counsel for Defendant
RAMON CERRANO

2
3
4
5 Dated: November 2, 2022

/s/ BARBARA H. O'NEILL
BARBARA H. O'NEILL
Counsel for Defendant
ALEXIS SERRANO

6
7
8
9
10 Dated: November 2, 2022

/s/ ROGER D. WILSON
ROGER D. WILSON
Counsel for Defendant
ELEAZAR VALENZUELA

11
12
13 Dated: November 2, 2022

/s/ STEVEN CRAWFORD
STEVEN L. CRAWFORD
Counsel for Defendant
RAFAEL RODRIGUEZ

14
15
16
17 **ORDER**

18 IT IS SO ORDERED that the status conference is continued from November 9, 2022, to **January**
19 **25, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe.** Time is excluded pursuant to
20 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv).

21
22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: November 3, 2022

/s/ *Barbara A. McAuliffe*
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE